

Mail Stop Interference  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria Va 22313-1450  
Tel: 571-272-4683  
Fax: 571-273-0042

Filed: May 2, 2007

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

KARL KLAUS CONZELMANN

Junior Party

(U.S. Patent No. 6,033,886),

v.

JIN HONG, PETER PALESE,

AND DAVID K. CLARKE,

Senior Party

(U.S. Application No. 09/724,388).

Patent Interference No. 105,503 (MPT)  
(Technology Center 1600)

1 Before: JAMESON LEE, SALLY C. MEDLEY, and MICHAEL P. TIERNEY,  
2 *Administrative Patent Judges.*  
3 TIERNEY, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

4  
5 **JUDGMENT - ADVERSE - Bd. R. 127(b)**  
6

7 Hong has filed a request for adverse judgment as to Count 1, the sole count  
8 in interference. (Paper 41). Accordingly, judgment on priority is entered against  
9 Hong as to Count 1.

10 No motions remain in the interference. Specifically, three Hong motions  
11 and one Conzelmann motion were filed in the interference. Hong Motion 1, which  
12 requested that Conzelmann claim 5 be designated as corresponding to Count 1 was

1 dismissed as moot. (Paper 42). Hong Motion 2, which requested that Conzelmann  
2 claims 1, 3, 5, 8 and 12 be held unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) was also  
3 dismissed as moot. (Paper 37, p. 6). Hong Motion 3, which requested that all of  
4 Conzelmann's claims be held unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) was granted-  
5 in-part with respect to the extent it requested that Conzelmann claim 9 be held  
6 unpatentable and dismissed with respect to Conzelmann claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 12.  
7 (Paper 37, p. 7). Conzelmann Motion 1, which requested that all of Hong's claims  
8 be held unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 135(b)(1) was dismissed as moot. (Paper  
9 42).

10  
11 It is:

12 **Ordered** that judgment on priority as to Count 1, the sole count in  
13 interference (Redeclaration, Paper 19, p. 2), is awarded against Hong.

14 **Further Ordered** that Hong is not entitled to a patent containing claims 7-  
15 10, 12, 17, 18, 20 and 22 of U.S. Application 09/724,388, all of which correspond  
16 to Count 1.

17 **Further Ordered** that Conzelmann is not entitled to a patent containing  
18 claim 9. (Paper 37, p. 7, ll. 2-11, granting Hong Motion 3 with respect to claim 9).

19 **Further Ordered** that a copy of this paper shall be made of record in the  
20 files of Hong, U.S. Application 09/724,388 and Conzelmann, U.S. Patent  
21 6,033,886.

22 **Further Ordered** that the parties' attention is directed to 35 U.S.C. §135(c)  
23 and Bd. R. 205.  
24  
25

1	<u>/Jameson Lee/</u>	)	
2	JAMESON LEE	)	
3	Administrative Patent Judge	)	
4		)	
5		)	
6	<u>/Sally C. Medley/</u>	)	BOARD OF PATENT
7	SALLY C. MEDLEY	)	
8	Administrative Patent Judge	)	APPEALS AND
9		)	
10		)	INTERFERENCES
11	<u>/Michael P. Tierney/</u>	)	
12	MICHAEL P. TIERNEY	)	
13	Administrative Patent Judge	)	

14

15

16 cc (electronic filing):

17 Counsel for **CONZELMANN**:

18 R. Danny Huntington, Esq.  
 19 BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP  
 20 2020 K Street, N.W.  
 21 Washington, D.C. 20006-1806  
 22 Danny.huntington@bingham.com  
 23 Sharon.crane@bingham.com

24

25 Counsel for HONG:

26

27 Thomas E. Friebe, Esq.  
 28 JONES DAY  
 29 222 East 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
 30 New York, N.Y. 10017-6702  
 31 tefriebe@jonesday.com  
 32 lacoruzzi@jonesday.com